

IOWAccess Project 10 Electronic Commerce Business Plan MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Friday, March 27, 1998

TIME: 9:00 am - 12:00 Noon

LOCATION: Iowa Workforce Development Building

ATTENDEES:

KPMG

Manuel Cantoria, Steve Krach, Alex Kao, Steve Schweitzer

IOWAccess Project 10 Team

Gina Noll, Cynthia Eisenhauer, Ray Vawter, Jim Youngblood, Dave Arringdale, Linda Plazak, Mary Maloney, Mark Slatterly, Bruce Coney

Authored By: Steven B. Schweitzer, KPMG

Cynthia Eisenhauer opened the meeting by collaboratively creating an agenda for the session. The agreed-to agenda:

1. Agree on common definition of Project 10 deliverable expectations
2. Discuss role of ITS
3. ID business plan gaps and responsible parties to gather data
4. Review KPMG Survey, validate questions, scope and process to get responses
5. Look at current projects & target projects
6. Revisit Timeline and resources; ie - financial requirements

Addressing Agenda Item #1: *(Agree on common definition of Project 10 deliverable expectations)*

ITS comments: The concept of providing direction is missing from the current draft of the business plan (BP). A business plan to Jim Youngblood suggests direction, goals, milestones, targets, end expectations and suggested best practices. The current draft seems boilerplate, not creative and needs more direction-oriented language. It was suggested that the BP should include a snapshot of where to be over the next 3 years and more input from the private sector industry. It was pointed out that the current draft of the business plan reflects the direction of the Project 10 team's discussion to-date: where KPMG was tasked to develop an EC framework to evaluate projects (with accompanying "guidebook"), not so much a classic business plan or to provide actual project review and prioritization.

After much discussion, it was decided the revised deliverable expectation should include the following concepts:

1. Determine the Direction for EC in the State of Iowa
2. Include case studies, best practices, standards, recommendations & other markets.
3. Include criteria for evaluating projects, i.e.-a "framework".
4. Organizational Responsibilities & linkages to other projects in Iowa
5. "Workbook", formerly known as "Guidebook"
6. Identify applications and projects and prioritize them using the BP methodology.

The above is compared to the original project deliverable as detailed in the original outline of the Draft Business Plan.

The question was posed: Do we have enough data to provide more directive content in the BP. It was agreed to that more data needed to be collected; that the survey response to-date (6) was insufficient. It was suggested to meet with private sector companies and other agencies as well as some citizens; to get a feel for EC from their perspective. A follow-up call to Jim Y. and Dave A. will be required to coordinate this effort. KPMG will initiate on Monday, March 30, 1998.

Addressing Agenda Item #2: *(Discuss role of ITS)*

This discussion point took two tangents. A) What is the role of ITS in relation to Project 1 and Project 10; and, B) What is the role of ITS *on* Project 10.

A) ITS wants Project 10 to supply guidelines, best practices and standards for the various systems areas (security, authentication, platforms, etc) based on our experience. These will be used in conjunction with the external vendor recommendations from Project 1 to create a systems/ infrastructure foundation for IOWA intergovernmental EC applications

B) ITS wants to know WHAT EC projects are in play currently and their relative priority, while the agencies (users) want to know HOW to evaluate potential EC opportunities. The role of ITS as of the date of this meeting has been minimal, thus the direction and expectation of the deliverable migrated more towards the user; where the "how-to" was more adequately addressed. The issue of what projects, what technologies and what priorities have come into more focus with the involvement of ITS.

Addressing Agenda Item #3: *(ID business plan gaps and responsible parties to gather data)*

Some data gaps were discussed, but all detailed discussions were deferred until item #4 is resolved. Additionally, the changing scope of the project deliverable has created a need for additional data to be collected to complete the project.

Addressing Agenda Item #4: *(Review KPMG Survey, validate questions, scope and process to get responses)*

It was agreed to push back this agenda item and allow KPMG, Dave Arringdale and Linda Plazak to work through additional issues regarding data collection. KPMG agreed to call Dave A. on Monday, March 30, 1998, to discuss those issues offline.

As of the date of this writing, the meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 01 April.

Addressing Agenda Item #5: *(Look at current projects & target projects)*

Like above, it was agreed to postpone this agenda item. KPMG and Dave Arringdale will identify the current projects and identify resources required to research additional projects in play.

Addressing Agenda Item #6: *(Revisit Timeline and resources; ie - financial requirements)*

Like above, it was agreed to postpone this agenda item. KPMG and Dave Arringdale will identify the current projects and identify resources required to research additional projects in play.

General Meeting Notes

The Project 10 workteam is committed to producing a quality deliverable:

- One that meets the requirements of the project team and the various constituencies, and balances and resource constraints within the reduced (~33%) budget
- One that does not marginalize any one constituency's contributions and expectations at the expense of any other(s), unless agreed-to by the work team
- One that allows us to assume an acceptable level of risk/exposure given the budgets for this project (e.g., deliver fair value for the price)

It was agreed that the March 31st deadline will be exceeded and that another 30 days could be extended without impacting any of the other IOWAccess projects. The final delivery date will be set upon future discussions with KPMG and ITS.

Some of the items that KPMG and Dave Arringdale have agreed to discuss offline are:

1. What EC projects are in progress that are not on the list of "42"?
2. Who are the relevant resources to interview at the state agency level? Private sector level? Citizen level?
3. Review the KPMG survey for relevancy at this point. Modify accordingly and re-issue.
4. Identify additional internal ITS and KPMG resources necessary to survey additional EC projects.
5. Identify the anticipated timeframe and level of effort required to complete the Business Plan. IOWAccess and KPMG will commit resources to complete project on a timely basis.

The project prioritization table will include the following project characteristics:

- Project name
- Project description
- Timeframe to implementation
- ROI or other suitable financial measure
- Prioritization

There were several debates as to the correct nomenclature for the existing "Business Plan" and "Guidebook". It was recommended to use "Business Plan" to reference the enhanced document containing the existing content and the addition of more direction, best practice information, case studies and project prioritization. The jury is still out on the best phrasing for the existing "Guidebook" understanding. ITS stated the three components it seeks from Project 10 is 1) an EC Strategy, 2) A Business Plan and 3) a Workbook.

Given the revised scope of the project deliverable, KPMG asked if there were additional persons that should be on the list to review all subsequent drafts of the BP or additional persons to interview for data collection. Gina Noll offered to provide those to KPMG. As of the publish date of this memo, G. Noll, via L. Plazak, has forwarded 13 names of private sector representatives to interview.